

# True Cosmology:

## The Earth that the LORD God of All Creation made for His Son

by Jeremy James



By way of introduction, I'd like to share two experiences that prompted me to research this paper in the first instance.

### First Experience

Not long after I was saved, I memorized a number of Psalms, including Psalm 19. As I prayed it in my mind from time to time over the past few years, I was struck again and again by the force of the following verses:

**"The heavens declare the glory of God ... In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof."**

I just couldn't shake off the feeling that the LORD was speaking about a sun that actually moved, not a stationary object around which the earth revolved. In the language of the Bible a bridegroom is a very positive figure, the embodiment of all that is joyous and fulfilling in life. The LORD even applies the name to Himself, both as the husband of Israel and as the groom at the marriage feast of the Lamb.

In this Psalm the sun is compared to a bridegroom coming out of his chamber or resting place, and exultantly running a race. The apostle Paul uses a similar image in 1 Corinthians, namely that of an athlete running a race, to describe a life dedicated wholly to Christ. The Psalm goes on to say that the sun follows a circuit (or orbit) from one end of heaven to the other. And since **"nothing is hid from the heat thereof"**, the sun must shine on every part of the earth in the course of its daily circuit.

Initially it seemed expedient to interpret this passage of Scripture in 'modern' terms, where the earth goes around the sun, but the Bible, I have found, is a remarkably literal expression of God's message to mankind. If the LORD describes the sun so vividly, as an object joyously traversing the sky in a great circuit and heating everything beneath it, then perhaps I ought to re-examine the heliocentric doctrine taught to me as a child.


## Second Experience

This takes me to my second experience, which is based on another doctrine absorbed during my school days. According to our Geography teacher, the phases of the moon are caused by the moon's rotation around the earth, where the angle between the surface of the moon and the stationary sun determines the amount of light falling on the surface of the moon and therefore the 'phase' seen from earth. As an enquiring child I tried to imagine how this would work, but had great difficulty visualizing the relative positions of the sun, moon and earth as the phase sequence unfolded over the 29.5 days (on average) of the moon's period of rotation.

Following my Psalm 19 experience, I decided to revisit my moon phase conundrum and see if I could figure it out. Bear in mind I am now nearly age 60, so an exercise like this seemed a little childish. However, when I went online to find examples of the moon's phases and the planetary movements needed to produce them, I had no success. Even an orrery or working model of the earth, sun and moon failed to describe correctly their relative positions. In the standard clockwork model, the earth rotated on its axis 29 times while the moon completed one orbit around it. This may satisfy the eye, but not the mind. What happened to the additional part-day in the lunar period?



Consider the example below which I constructed for my own edification. The chart shows two successive full moons over Paris, the first on 2 July, 2015, and the second on 31 July. The synodic interval between the two events is 29 days, 8 hours and 24 minutes ('Synodic' refers to the time interval between a moon phase, such as a perfectly full moon, and the next appearance of the same phase). The chart is designed to answer a very basic question: How is it possible for Paris to be in the right position to witness the second full moon if 29.35 days have elapsed? During that time interval the earth will have rotated 29 and one third times. The additional third of a revolution means that, on the second occasion, Paris will no longer be in the right position but will have rotated to a position where the moon will not even be visible. What is more, if the second full moon occurs at 11.44am, will not the sun also be visible over Paris? How is this possible, given that a full moon depends on the alignment of the sun, moon and earth?



When the chart failed to answer my many questions, I tried to duplicate the relative movements of the three celestial bodies on the floor of my study. In order to do this I had to take into account the known facts of lunar motion, based on the heliocentric model:

1. The moon is in synchronous rotation around the earth. This means the time it takes to revolve once on its own axis is exactly equal to the time it takes to complete one orbit of the earth. For this reason the same side of the moon is permanently facing the earth.

2. Every location on earth has sight of a full moon every month, cloud cover permitting.

3. One half of the moon is always illuminated by the sun. The only exception is when the earth interposes itself momentarily between the two and causes a lunar eclipse. [A lunar eclipse can occur only during a full moon since all three must be aligned and temporarily on the same plane for this to happen. The moon normally orbits at a slight angle to the plane of the earth's rotation around the sun, so an eclipse does not occur very often.]

4. The average synodic interval is never less than 29.18 days and never more than 29.93 days, with an average over the year of 29.53 days (29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes).

Try as I might, there was no way I could align the three spheres on the floor of my study to reproduce the phases of the moon correctly while also observing the four rules set out above. It didn't work whether the sun was moving or stationary, or whether the earth or the moon, respectively, were revolving, rotating, or stationary. But we know from experience and observation that it does happen! Since this is the case, it seemed necessary to discard a fundamental assumption of modern astronomy, namely that the earth is a globe.

### **What does the Bible say?**

To get a proper perspective on all of this we need to return to the Bible and consider more fully what it tells us about the earth, the moon, the sun and the stars. This is sometimes referred to as cosmology, the study of the cosmos and its underlying structure. Unless we have a clear grasp of Biblical cosmology, we are liable to make the kind of errors that others – it would seem! – have made before us.

#### **- The Earth**

When God made the heavens and the earth he separated the "waters below" from the "waters above". The space between the two is called "the firmament". We understand the "waters below" to refer to the oceans and any water beneath the surface of the earth, such as enormous aquifers and subterranean lakes. Some Bible scholars believe the "waters above" may refer to the totality of moisture in the atmosphere, while Henry Morris speculated that it could have been a contiguous canopy of moisture in the upper atmosphere before the Flood, which, due to massive volcanic disturbances in the earth at the time of the Flood, came raining down upon the earth. However, if we stick as closely as possible to the literal meaning of the text, it is hard not to conclude that the "waters above" are actually above the "firmament" and thus located far out in what we think of today as deep space.

The "firmament" comprises "the heavens". The King James Bible translates the first verse of Genesis as "**In the beginning, God made the heaven and the earth**", but this should have been translated "heavens" [plural, as in the original Hebrew]. The Bible speaks of three heavens. The first we understand to be the atmosphere of the earth itself. The second is the region beyond our atmosphere that contains the sun and the moon. Finally, the third is the heaven that Paul was "caught up to" in the experience recorded in 2 Corinthians 12:2. The particular heaven being referred to in any passage of Scripture must be inferred from its context. When "heavens" are referred to, it is necessary to determine whether two heavens only are implied, or all three.

The Bible clearly indicates that the earth is flat since, in the process of creating the earth and setting it in place, the LORD performed an act of spreading or stretching, an operation that cannot be performed on a sphere:

**"Thus saith God the LORD...  
he that spread forth the earth..." (Isaiah 42:5)**

**"To him that stretched out the earth above the waters:  
for his mercy endureth forever." (Psalm 136:6)**

The Hebrew word for "spread" or "stretch" is even more emphatic – *raqa* [Strong's H7554], meaning 'to spread out by beating, as a thin plate' (Gesenius).

The following verses also imply a flat, stretched-out earth:

**"For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his  
mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from  
the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us."  
(Psalm 103:11-12)**

If it is to make sense, this simile cannot apply to a spherical earth, where east and west are not truly apart, but actually come together again on the other side. However, on a flat earth, east and west are as far apart as they can be. This would even suggest that, as the simile refers to east and west, and not north and south, that the earth is extended or "stretched" to a greater extent in an east-west direction than in a north-south direction.

When Satan came before the throne of God, as recorded in the second chapter of the Book of Job, he was asked where he had been:

**"And the LORD said unto Satan, From whence comest thou?  
And Satan answered the LORD, and said, From going to and  
fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."  
(Job 2:2)**

The account that Satan gives of his activity is much more applicable to a flat surface – to and fro, up and down – than it is to a spherical one. Even in Hebrew these terms carry no suggestion of curvature. Given that Satan was capable of traversing the entire earth – as his response implies (and he cannot lie before God) – it is notable that he uses terms that are applicable to a plane rather than a sphere.

Also, when Satan tempted Jesus and took him to a high mountain, he showed him all the kingdoms of the world:

**"And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain,  
shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a  
moment of time." (Luke 4:5)**

The addition of the words **"in a moment of time"** suggests that the entire earth was immediately visible from that spot. If so, then the earth was flat.

The prophet Daniel makes a similar reference to the totality of the earth when he refers to the great tree that Nebuchadnezzar had seen in his dream:

**"The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached  
unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth"  
(Daniel 4:11)**

The great tree, which reached to the sky, could only have been visible **"to the end of all the earth"** if the earth were flat.

Revelation 1:7 also states that, when Christ returns (as King of the entire earth), everyone will be able to see him: **"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him"**. This too, like the temptation on the high mountain, is indicative of an event that takes place above a flat earth.

Some commentators cite Isaiah 40:22 as evidence that the Bible teaches the sphericity of the earth: **"It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth..."** However, the prophet is clearly speaking of a circle or a disc, and not a sphere. The Hebrew word for "circle" in this verse is **chuwg**, meaning a circle, circuit or compass. Had Isaiah intended to refer to a sphere, he could have used the word **duwr**, meaning a ball, which he had already used in another chapter:

**"He will surely violently turn and toss thee like a ball  
into a large country" (Isaiah 22:18)**

We will return to this question later.

## **- The Sun**

We have already cited the passage from Psalm 19 which describes the sun as a bridegroom. We know also that, from the episodes regarding King Hezekiah and the plain of Gibeon (near Jerusalem), respectively, that God reversed the motion of the sun for Hezekiah and stopped it for Joshua.

There are also dozens of passages that refer to the rising and going down of the sun. For example, Psalm 113:3 says, **"From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same the LORD'S name is to be praised."** Psalm 104:19 states **"... the sun knoweth his going down"**, while Ecclesiastes 1:5 says: **"The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hastens to his place where he arose."**

The Book of Job also notes that the LORD **"...commandeth the sun and it riseth not...."** (Job 9:7) This could refer either to an actual historical incident, akin to those involving Hezekiah and Joshua, but not recorded in the Bible, or it could refer simply to a power that God may exercise should He so choose. Either way, the implication is very clear, namely that everything in the universe is subject at all times to the permissive will of God. The idea that God set everything in motion in the beginning and then stepped aside is completely false. He is as near to His creation today as when He brought it into existence.

### **- The Moon**

At the same time that the LORD stopped the sun over Gibeon at the request of Joshua, He stopped the moon over the valley of Ajalon (possibly a town by the same name). This incident is also referred to by the prophet Habbakuk: **"The sun and the moon stood still in their habitation."** (Habakkuk 3:11) The "habitation" to which he refers may be equivalent to the "tabernacle" of the sun in Psalm 19:4, though the Hebrew words are different.

The moon, with its strict sequence of phases, seems to have been intended as a universally recognizable way of dividing the month into segments and the year into seasons: **"He appointed the moon for seasons..."** (Psalm 104:19) This was especially important when setting the dates for the seven feasts of Israel, all of which were computed by reference to the date of the new moon. These feasts were not only central to the spiritual life of Israel but served to highlight the key stages or 'seasons' in the LORD's wonderful program of redemption for mankind.

For several hundred years science has taught that the moon reflects the light of the sun and that, unlike the other celestial bodies mentioned in the Bible, it is not self-luminous. However, it has long been observed that the 'quality' of light from the moon is very different from that of the sun. The book of Deuteronomy makes a startling statement in this regard: **"And for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon..."** (Deuteronomy 33:14) This would suggest that moonlight possesses certain physical characteristics that are not found in sunlight.

Isaiah lends support to this interpretation when he states that the moon "causes" her light to shine, just like the stars:

**"For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine." (Isaiah 13:10)**

Isaiah later made another reference to the appearance or complexion of the moon in the Tribulation period:

**"Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the LORD bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound." (Isaiah 30:26)**

In normal circumstances, the sun is far more than seven times brighter than the moon. Clearly, if the light of the moon is increased in intensity until it equals the light of the sun, while the intensity of the sun is increased sevenfold, then the sun cannot be the source of the moon's light.

Ezekiel would also appear to be distinguishing between the sun and a self-luminous moon in the following verse:

**"And when I shall put thee out, I will cover the heaven, and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light."  
(Ezekiel 32:7)**

The concept of dominion, jurisdiction or rulership is an important one in the Bible, so when the moon is said to "rule" by night, in conjunction with the stars, we would expect it to enjoy the same self-luminous status:

**"The moon and stars to rule by night: for his mercy endureth forever." (Psalm 136:9)**

The Book of Revelation also seems to refer to a self-luminous moon when it states:

**"And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." (Revelation 21:23)**

If the moon needed the sun in order to "shine", then the reference to the moon in this verse would be, not just superfluous, but somewhat confusing. Much the same difficulty would arise in the following verse from Isaiah:

**"Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the LORD of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." (Isaiah 24:23)**

Another verse from the Book of Revelation is even more suggestive of a self-luminous moon:

**"... and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood" (Revelation 6:12)**



If the sun has become black, it is not emitting any light; and if that is the case, then the moon (which is meant to be dependent on the sun for light) would no longer be visible and could not have the appearance of blood.

The Apostle Paul also seems to be implying that the moon has a "glory" of its own, a self-luminous character akin to that of the sun and the stars:

**"There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory." (1 Corinthians 15:41)**

While these passages may not convince everyone, their meaning is quite plain.

It is interesting to note also that, of the three bodies examined so far, the Bible does not imply that they necessarily have a three-dimensional shape. Since both the sun and moon are observable – and are described as such – we would seem to be justified in assuming they are *either* disc-shaped *or* spherical. Naturally, the modern view is that both are definitely spherical, but for the moment we simply want to establish the Biblical position.

## **- The Stars**

In the first chapter of Genesis, God says that He made the stars on the fourth day, along with the sun and the moon:

**"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also."**

Their purpose is also stated:

**"...let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: And...to give light upon the earth."**

If the moon is "for seasons" and the sun enables us to keep track of the passing days and years, then we can reasonably infer that the stars are "for signs". This may refer to their role in navigation on the great oceans or across expansive terrain. Until very recently most folk had daily access to the brilliance of the night sky and would have known intimately the star patterns in their immediate vicinity. As such they constituted an accessible, ever present, and reassuringly familiar pattern of nocturnal signs.

In her song, Deborah states the following:

**"They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera." (Judges 5:20)**

The Hebrew word for "courses" in this verse is ***mecillah*** which can also mean a *highway, causeway, path* or *road*. Modern science rejects the notion that the stars rotate daily around the earth, as this verse would seem to imply. Instead it teaches that the perceived motion of the stars is due entirely to the daily rotation of the earth on its axis. In other words, science teaches that the observer on earth is moving, not the canopy of stars. However, the fact that the verse is expressed in the active voice – "the stars...fought against Sisera" – suggests that the stars themselves are actually in motion.

## **- The Heavens**

We have already noted some of the characteristics of "the heavens" in the section about the earth. We would like to note here a further characteristic that the heavens share with the earth:

**"I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded." (Isaiah 45:12)**

**"Thus saith God the LORD, he that created the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein:" (Isaiah 42:5)**

These verses from Isaiah show that the heavens too are "stretched out", just like the earth. Another verse from Isaiah, as well as one from the Book of Revelation, refer to the rolling together of the heavens in the End Time:

**"And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree." (Isaiah 34:4)**

**"And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places." (Revelation 6:14)**

The figure here is that of a manuscript which, having been stretched out in order to be read, is rolled back up again and is no longer visible. Since Revelation 6:12 had already referred to the sun and the moon (which are located in the second heaven), we can infer that 6:14 refers to the heaven where the stars are located, that is the third heaven. This would imply that the *second* heaven will *not* be rolled together like a scroll. Instead, the sun and the moon will remain in the second heaven during the Tribulation, but the sun will turn black and the moon will turn to blood (presumably for a significant portion of the Tribulation period).

The Book of Job also tells us that God Himself "is in the height of heaven" –

**"Is not God in the height of heaven? and behold the height of the stars, how high they are!" (Job 22:12)**

This can only refer to the third heaven. Since there are only three heavens, then God must reside (in some sense) in the same heaven as the stars. The remainder of the verse would seem to suggest that the stars are in the lower part of the third heaven, while God is in the higher part.

When interpreting this verse from Job we must have regard to 1 Kings 8:27 –

**"...behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee"**

So, while God is present in the upper part of the third heaven, it does not enclose Him. The vastness of God cannot be comprehended by something that He created, however exalted it may be.

### **- The Foundations of the Earth**

We will now address a topic which, seemingly, has received very little attention in the annals of Biblical scholarship. It is hardly ever referred to by preachers and it is doubtful whether anyone who reads this paper will have come across a sermon on the subject. For example, in their major study of Biblical geology, *The Genesis Flood* (1961) by John Whitcomb and Henry Morris, the authors refer only once to "the foundations of the earth" and reach no satisfactory conclusion as to what the term might mean:

"On the other hand, it is just as reasonable to say that the core and mantle [of the earth] simply were created, in essentially their present form. Perhaps these are the "foundations of the earth," of which the Bible often speaks (e.g. Jeremiah 31:37, Isaiah 48:13, etc). It is questionable whether man will ever be able to observe directly the nature of these foundations or the processes that take place there, but it is probable that they exert great influence upon many of the geological phenomena at the surface..." [p.221]

Since Whitcomb and Morris were assuming a spherical earth – without having examined the verses of Scripture pertaining to that question – it is not surprising that they had difficulty interpreting the term, "the foundations of the earth."

There are several verses in Scripture that virtually pulverize the heliocentric model. Chief among them is the following:

**"The world also is stablished, that it cannot be moved." (Psalm 93:1)**

The word "stablished" in the KJV is equivalent to the modern words *established* or *fixed*. Lest the reader have any doubt, the Bible proceeds to define it: **"that it cannot be moved."**

The Word of God states clearly and categorically that the earth cannot be moved unless God Himself decides to move it. However, nearly all leading commentators treat this passage figuratively. For example, "The psalmist consoles himself with the thought that the world was firmly established; that no storm or tempest could be so violent as to remove it out of its place" (Barnes); "the church has been tossed about with tempests, and has been moved from place to place, and obliged to fly into the wilderness; yet, in the latter day, it will be established on the top of the mountains" (Gill); "...even the globe itself would fly through space...if the Lord did not hold it in its appointed orbit" (Spurgeon).

In order to see how literal this passage is, we need to compare scripture with scripture:

**"...the world also shall be stable, that it be not moved...."  
(1 Chronicles 16:30)**

**"Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not  
be removed for ever." (Psalm 104:5)**

**"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?  
declare, if thou hast understanding...Whereupon are the  
foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the  
corner stone thereof...?" (Job 38:4&6)**

**"For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens;  
God himself that formed the earth and made it; he  
hath established it [i.e. fixed it in place], he created it  
not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the  
LORD; and there is none else." (Isaiah 45:18)**

Again the same thought is hammered home – the earth is stable; it cannot be moved, either now or in the future; it is fixed or fastened to foundations which are themselves secured in a way that man seemingly cannot understand. It is difficult to interpret these passages in any way other than their plain meaning. Indeed, if the earth *is* fixed and the LORD wanted to confirm the fact for our benefit, it is hard to see how the text of Scripture would differ from the words already used.

It is notable that the Book of Job refers to the "corner stone" on which the foundations of the world are fastened. This is a special word in Scripture, one that is applied almost exclusively to Christ.

The foundations of the earth are also compared to "pillars" in Job 9:6 -

**"Which shaketh the earth out of her place,  
and the pillars thereof tremble."**

This would suggest that the foundations of the earth are considerably deeper than the earth itself. The image would seem to be that of a great disc supported by a foundation of pillars or piles, which are themselves embedded in a great 'stone' whose nature surpasses our understanding.

If this is the case, then the earth and its foundations are suspended in space. Job 26:7 would seem to confirm this:

**"He stretcheth out the north over the empty place,  
and hangeth the earth upon nothing."**

The concept of "the north", as it is employed in this verse, suggests that the north pole comprises the center of the disc of the earth, around which the earth is "stretched". The earth (including its foundations) then "hangs" as it were from this central point, suspended above nothing.

If this is the case, then the stars in their "circuit" are rotating like a scroll around this central point. We know also that this point, the north pole, is itself permanently aligned with a star known as Polaris, around which the radiant canopy of the constellations revolves.

The permanency of the earth's foundations, and thus the immovable nature of the earth itself, is highlighted dramatically in the Book of Jeremiah. The prophet spent most of his life warning the children of Israel that their nation would be destroyed if they did not repent of their idolatry and return to the LORD. This awful message was softened from time to time by a promise from God that He would later bring them back to their own land. Following their first scattering – which began in 606 BC – a remnant eventually returned to Israel from Babylon in 536 BC. This was 70 years later as the prophet had foretold. However, Jeremiah referred also to a later worldwide scattering and regathering, which would involve not just Judah but Ephraim as well (i.e. both the northern and southern kingdoms, "the house of Israel and the house of Judah"). This regathering began in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and continues today. When Christ returns, in response to the forlorn call of his people, he will defeat the Antichrist and establish Israel as a kingdom that will continue into eternity – **"it shall not be plucked up, nor thrown down any more for ever."** (Jeremiah 31:40)

As a token of His commitment to carry through with this promise, no matter what doubts may enter into the minds and hearts of men, He said that it would be broken – meaning that Israel would cease to exist as a nation – ONLY if the orderly sequence of night and day should ever break down. Since this is inconceivable, the possibility that He might renege on His promise is also inconceivable:

**"Thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; The LORD of hosts is his name: If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the LORD, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me for ever. Thus saith the LORD; If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the LORD."**

**(Jeremiah 31:35-37)**

The earnest of His commitment to deliver on His promise includes a reference to the measurement of the "heaven above" and the foundations of the earth "beneath". Since the orderly continuation of night and day is stated as a certainty, then the impossibility that mankind should at some time in the future be able to measure the depths of interstellar space or the foundations of the earth is equally certain!

Please dwell for a moment on this passage since it is extremely important. God is telling us that despite the vaunted claims by scientists today to have done both – namely to have determined the outer extent of the universe and the diameter of the sphere of the earth – they have actually done neither! This means that the earth cannot be a sphere since the diameter of a sphere could be measured. It also means, amazingly, that space travel (including unmanned space travel) is impossible, for if it were then mankind would be able to send vehicles far into space that could perform the necessary scientific measurements.

This is a spectacular finding since it is Biblical proof that many of the claims made by NASA are false.

## **Apparent anomalies**

Before we examine the implications of this finding, we will first take a brief look at some apparent anomalies that we can readily observe in the world around us. Rather than spend time analysing each of them, we will leave it to the reader to reflect on the truth (or otherwise) of each anomaly, based on his own experience. [Further information on these anomalies can be found by searching the Internet.]

### **1. Why does the moon always show the same side to the earth?**

Scientists say that, even though the moon rotates on its axis, we never see its opposite side because the period of the moon's rotation is exactly equal to the time it takes to travel around the earth. Since this is not a physical necessity under Newton's Laws, it is a very convenient coincidence for supporters of the earth's sphericity. Also, despite purporting to explain the congruence of the two cycles, it fails to account for the very significant variation in the length of the lunar cycle, which can be as short as 29.18 days or as long as 29.93 days.

## **2. Why is the moon always lit uniformly?**

If the moon is a sphere and is illuminated almost exclusively by light from the sun, then one would expect the region of the moon that is facing directly at the sun to be more brightly illuminated than the regions closer to the edge of the moon as seen from the earth. Light reflected at an angle is never as intense as light reflected directly. However, during a full moon, all parts of the moon are illuminated to the same intensity, even the regions very close to the edge of the moon. Either the moon is not a sphere or it is not illuminated by the sun.



**Full moon in the daytime (Morocco)**

## **3. How can a full moon be visible during the day?**

If the moon is a sphere and is illuminated almost exclusively by light from the sun, then a full moon can be observed only when the sun is behind the earth and all three are in alignment (The earth does not obstruct the sun's light in this arrangement since the plane in which the moon is orbiting is at an 8 degree angle to that of the earth's orbital plane relative to the sun). If this is true, as scientists allege, then how can the full moon be seen during the day, as is sometimes the case? It should not be possible to see both the sun and the full moon if all three are meant to be in alignment!

## **4. How can the moon's surface detail be seen so clearly with the naked eye?**

The highest mountain on the moon is Mons Huygens at 5,500 metres (about 18,000ft). Just how distinct would such an object be, or even a long line of such objects, at a distance of 240,000 miles? Some people claim to have seen an approaching airplane at a distance of 150 miles. This would seem an exaggeration, but let's assume they are correct. We will assume, also, that the aircraft is 150ft in length (a Boeing 737 can be up to 138ft in length).

This gives a 'length-to-distance' ratio of 1:5280. If we perform a similar calculation for Mons Huygens, we get a 'height-to-distance' ratio of 1:70400. It is difficult to believe that objects on the moon are easier to see by a factor of 14, especially as most of the lunar surface detail that we *do* see varies in elevation by no more than 1,000ft or so. The moon must therefore be much closer to the earth than we suppose.

### **5. Why does the moon light up only those clouds that are nearest to it?**

We have all seen dozens of photos like the one shown below.

If the moon were 240,000 miles from the earth, its light would illuminate the earth with parallel beams. If that were the case, then no part of the night sky should be more brightly illuminated than any other. But this photo (and thousands like it) shows that the region of the sky that is closer to the moon is more brightly lit. Again we conclude that the moon is much closer to the earth than we commonly suppose.



### **6. How is it possible to observe a full moon every month?**

The moon always takes more than 29 days to complete its synodic cycle. In order to observe two successive full moons from the same location on earth, the location must in each instance be directly facing the moon. However, the earth will have completed more than 29 rotations by the time the moon has completed its synodic cycle and the target location will have rotated away from the required position (See the diagram on p.3). We conclude that it is only possible to see a full moon every month from the same location if the earth is *not* rotating.



### **7. How can the sun's rays come through the clouds at different angles?**

If the sun were 93 million miles away, its rays would strike the earth in parallel. This would mean that all light falling in the same region would do so from the same direction. However, countless photos show clearly that this is not the case. A review of many such photos will confirm that this multi-ray effect is not caused by the optical properties of the atmosphere (though this is a factor), but by the relative proximity of the sun to the earth.



### **8. Why does Polaris never shift its position in the northern hemisphere?**

The star known as Polaris (also called the North Star or Pole Star) is permanently situated over the North Pole. For this reason all other stars are seen to rotate around it every 24 hours. Scientists contend that this apparent rotation is due entirely to the daily rotation of the earth and that the stars themselves are not in motion. However, this proposition is difficult to reconcile with long-exposure photos of circumpolar star trails – see photo overleaf.

Much the same photo can be taken from many other places on earth [check examples on the Internet]. If the earth is rotating then there ought to be some significant differences between these photos due to the so-called oscillation and tilt of the earth's axis, but this does not seem to be the case. On the other hand, if the star canopy is rotating around a flat, stationary earth, then all such photos should be – and are – almost identical.

Furthermore, if the star canopy is rotating once a day, it must be much closer to the earth than modern astronomers would have us believe. It is certainly not millions of light years away!



**Circumpolar star trails as seen from California.  
The star at the center is Polaris.**

### **9. How do rockets work in the vacuum of space?**

Rockets work in the vacuum of space by ejecting propellant at explosive force through a narrow nozzle. According to Newton's third law, the force (action) ejected exerts an equal and opposite force (reaction) on the rocket, causing it to move forward. Even if this explanation is valid, it conceals a major difficulty. From a purely mechanical point of view, it is virtually impossible to ensure that the aggregate vectors of force exerted by the millions of individual molecules in the explosive propellant are perfectly parallel and uniform. The random nature of motion at a molecular level will mean that any imbalance, however tiny, will translate into a corresponding imbalance in the counter-force, causing the vessel to spin.

In short, chaotic motion at a molecular level will result in chaotic motion at a macro level. This problem cannot be solved by adding more rocket nozzles since the aggregate of all vectors of force will still be chaotic and therefore unpredictable.

#### **10. Why don't manmade satellites melt in the sun's heat?**

The temperature in the vacuum of space is very close to zero degrees Kelvin. If that is the case, then there ought to be little risk of a satellite overheating. However, it is not that simple. When the sun's rays strike the surface of the metal they cause its temperature to rise. In order to remain cool, the metal must lose heat. There are only three ways it can do this – through convection, conduction, or radiation. Since convection and conduction require contact with matter (whether solid, liquid or gas), these methods will not work in the vacuum of space. This leaves radiation as the only way the satellite as a whole could lose heat. Even if the metal was able to radiate heat as quickly as it arrived from the sun – which is doubtful – some of it would still percolate into the hull via conduction. This heat would continue to build up inside the satellite and cause its internal components to fail.

#### **11. Why is the horizon never lower than eye level, no matter how high one goes?**

If the earth were flat or an extended plane in all directions, the horizon would never dip below eye level. On the other hand, if the earth were a sphere, the horizon would dip below eye level as we rose through higher levels of elevation (in a balloon, for example). The supposed curvature of the earth would conceal everything beyond our horizon and so the horizon should appear to sink lower in our field of vision as we rose higher. But this does not happen. Even in an airplane on a cloudless day the horizon remains at eye level as we look directly through the window.

#### **12. Air travel**

The direct-flight travel time from Dublin to New York is about 7.5 hours, while the direct-flight travel time from New York to Dublin is 6.8 hours. The difference is due the prevailing winds at that line of latitude, which run from west to east. This tends to lengthen the westbound flight-time and shorten the eastbound one.

However, if the earth is rotating in an easterly direction at 500 miles per hour (at the same latitude) a plane travelling at five hundred miles an hour would never reach Ireland.

The 'scientific' explanation tries to get around this by stating that the plane travels in the same *frame of reference* as the earth – but this is silly. This assumes that the atmosphere is also rotating at 500 mph. If it were, the entire surface of the earth would be wracked by turbulence of hurricane force.

What is the real explanation? The planes are travelling above a stationary earth.

### 13. Canal locks

At 137 miles, the Grand Union canal is the longest in the UK. Stretching from London to Birmingham, it has 166 locks. These separate the canal into compartments, which vary in length and elevation to accommodate the contours of the surrounding terrain.

What would happen if all of the locks were opened at the same time? The water would seek its own level along the entire length of the canal. No amount of 'curvature' or 'gravity' would prevent this. The argument that the oceans of the world are somehow different and therefore able to resist the supposed curvature of the earth is nonsensical.

Water will always seek its own level, irrespective of the volume of water concerned. Even very large volumes of water are non-rigid aggregations of molecules and, as such, will always behave in the same way as smaller aggregations. Their dynamic properties are identical.



Locks on the Grand Union Canal, UK

### 14. Why is the horizon at sea level not restricted by the earth's alleged curvature?

How far can you look out to sea while standing on the shore? The answer, of course, is "As far as the horizon." But how far is that?

Well, if the earth is curved and has a radius of 3,959 miles (as stated in the science textbooks), then it should "curve" downwards by 8 inches over a distance of one mile. However, the "curve" or drop is even steeper after the second mile, by reference to our line of sight. The reason for this is illustrated in the diagram below.


We can see from this diagram that the 'drop' increases by the square of the distance from the observer. The calculations are therefore as follows (where the asterisk means 'to the power of'):

After first mile:  $(1^2) \times 8" = 8"$

After second mile:  $(2^2) \times 8" = 32"$

After third mile:  $(3^2) \times 8" = 72"$

According to the science textbooks, this means that a man standing on the shore, whose height is 6'3" (and thus has an eye elevation of 72 inches), can see no further than 3 miles! But we know that this is not the case. It is possible at shore level to see much further than that. And with binoculars or field glasses it is possible to see even further. Since the binoculars are also restricted to our line of sight – they can't see around a bend – then they too should detect nothing further than three miles out to sea, but we know from experience that binoculars allow us to see very much further than that.



It ought to be obvious from this straightforward demonstration – based on something that is probably familiar to all our readers – that the earth simply cannot be spherical.

If one has difficulty accepting this, then it may help to consider our next example – see details in box overleaf.




The white arrow in the photo points to Baily Lighthouse at Howth, county Dublin, as seen from the seashore at Greystones, county Wicklow.

According to the formula for calculating the drop away from one's line of sight due to the supposed curvature of the earth, Baily Lighthouse, being **15.2 miles** distant [80,180ft], should be subject to a curvature drop of 154 feet (a). Since the lighthouse has a focal height (b) of 135 feet (41 meters), it ought to lie beneath one's line of sight at sea level. The photo was taken quite literally at sea level (where the camera was held only a few feet above the surface of the water), and yet the lighthouse is completely visible. Our demonstration is aided by the telescopic lens (x10) on the camera, which allows the necessary detail to be captured. (Again, we would emphasize that magnification has no effect on the line of sight.)

#### Notes

1. The curvature drop of 154 feet is calculated as follows:  $15.2 \times 15.2 \times 8" = 154$ .
2. The focal height of a lighthouse is the vertical distance between the center of the lens of the lighthouse lamp and the surface of the sea at average high tide.




This photo was taken on a moderately clear summer's day (10 August 2015) from the south beach at Greystones, Co Wicklow, Ireland. The camera (a Lumix Panasonic DMC-TZ3), which has a telescopic lens, was set at magnification x10. The photo depicts Howth Head, which lies on the north side of Dublin Bay. According to Google Earth, the distance between the spot where I was kneeling at sea level [53.08.31 North / 06.03.29 West] and Baily Lighthouse (indicated by the white arrow) [52.21.41 North / 06.03.09 West] was 80,180 feet.



*Wikipedia photo*

Baily Lighthouse is about 43 feet high and its lens stands about 135 feet above the average level of the high tide.



**The unimpeded line of sight between the south beach at Greystones and Baily Lighthouse, a distance of 15.2 statute miles.**



**Photo taken two days later (12 August 2015). This time we include Lambay Island which, according to Google Earth and other maps, should be almost entirely obscured by Howth Head! How come it's sitting way out in the Irish Sea?!**

**Photo taken from a sitting position on the sea shore.  
Telescopic magnification set at x10. Photo enlarged x5.**





Map of the Irish Sea showing the line of sight from Greystones to Baily Lighthouse and the Isle of Man, respectively.

The shorter distance is 15.2 miles and the longer is 85 miles.



Google Earth map showing how the line of sight from Greystones ought to “see” Lambay Island in alignment with Howth Head.  
Compare this with the view shown on the previous page!

The following enlargement, which is provided for verification purposes, shows Baily Lighthouse viewed from the same spot on the beach at Greystones, with the camera lens set at magnification x10:



Working strictly from the Google Earth map, as well as other scientific maps – all of which are based on the Curved Earth Model – it would be easy to confuse Lambay Island with the Isle of Man (which we did originally). However, the photos are accurate and the maps deceptive. Cartographical adjustments were made to the maps to make them conform to a spherical earth model. However, if the earth were spherical or spheroid, we would not be able to see Lambay sitting so far out in the Irish Sea. Since we do, we know the earth must be flat.


These photos prove that it is possible to see an object at least 15 miles away at sea level and not have any part of it obscured by the supposed curvature of the earth. The oceans of the world are all on the same plane (since water always seeks its own level). Advocates of the heliocentric model would have us believe that this is impossible – but the photos show otherwise. In short, the round earth theory is nonsense.

### **Why has the public been fooled for so long?**

Why has the public been fooled by this for so long? Surely, with the advent of digital cameras fitted with telescopic lenses, the round-earth deception would have been exposed before now? There would seem to be several reasons why this has not happened:

1. Our brains are conditioned by experience to process visual information by reference to what we *expect* to see. If we believe the earth is round, we will tend to discount any visual evidence to the contrary.
2. Belief in a flat earth has been ridiculed to such a degree that it is almost tantamount to lunacy. So, even on those rare occasions when a thinking person might query its veracity, he has little incentive to advertise what others will take as proof of his subnormal mental ability.

3. The round earth theory has been a central tenet of Globalist propaganda for centuries (Even the word 'Globalist' assumes a spherical earth). The media steadily indoctrinates the masses with a number of monumental lies and fixes them in our imagination. The pseudo-science of manmade 'global' warming is another example of this.
4. Should an inquisitive individual decide to actually measure the alleged curvature of the earth and test whether the theory is valid, he will run into a problem. Most of the explanations on the Internet calculate the curvature as a drop of 8 inches for every mile, but this is an elementary error (Some of these false explanations are found on disinformation websites). The drop of 8 inches applies to the first mile only. The reason for this ought to be apparent from the diagram on p.20 above. All calculations must be made by reference to the same line of sight. The 'drop' increases exponentially with the distance from the observer (who remains where he is).
5. Even if one has doubts about the sphericity of the earth, it can be hard to visualize certain physical properties of a flat earth. For example, why don't the oceans 'fall off'? Answer: The oceans themselves are surrounded by land, just like a lake. Or why have sailors not returned with incredible tales about the edge of the world? Answer: Because all southern sea journeys terminate at the Antarctic, which completely encircles the known landmass of the earth. This explains why early accounts of the coastal geography of Antarctica were so wildly inconsistent. It also explains why the world powers, via the UN, have completely forbidden all exploration of Antarctica. Interestingly, the UN uses a flag that actually depicts a flat earth! – see below.)



### **Fake moon rock**



**The American ambassador to the Netherlands formally presented a specimen of 'moon rock' to the Dutch Prime Minister during a good-will tour by the three 'cosmonauts', Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins, in 1969. This was later donated to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam and put on public display. In 2009 some visiting scientists expressed the view that the 'moon rock' was phony. The museum authorities had the specimen tested and found that it was nothing but petrified wood. According to a BBC news report, "US officials said they had no explanation for the Dutch discovery."**

### **Satan's Alternative Reality**

The Biblical account of creation, including all references to the structure of the universe, should be studied earnestly by all true believers. The Enemy has been working hard over the past five hundred years, building an 'alternative reality' for mankind, where the universe supposedly appeared spontaneously out of nothing (the so-called Big Bang); where all life, including man, "evolved" out of dirt; where man's soul is a fictitious entity (according to Freud) and yet man himself is intrinsically divine (New Age paganism); where the earth is a tiny speck at the edge of the cosmos; where the slaughter of millions of unborn children through abortion is morally neutral; where alien civilizations populate distant galaxies; where 'God is dead' and man must save himself; where all paths lead to heaven or Self-Realization or Cosmic Consciousness; and where mankind is a threat to the 'survival' of the earth, his original 'mother'. The list goes on and on.

The Master Liar tells masterful lies.

In His holy Word, the LORD God has told us many important truths about the world we live in. He made the earth before any celestial body. Above the earth He placed two major celestial bodies for signs and seasons, namely the sun and the moon. He also made the stars. These bodies were set in the firmament, the great vault of space above the earth. The firmament comprises three heavens – (1) the earth's atmosphere; (2) the region in which the sun and moon abide; and (3) the third heaven, which would appear to comprise two parts: in the lower reside the stars and in the upper the throne of God (which does not even begin to exhaust His greatness). Thus the LORD sits on His throne in the third heaven, while, figuratively speaking, the earth is His footstool – **"Thus saith the LORD, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool" (Isaiah 66:1)**

The earth, which is flat (like a footstool), is the center of the universe. Around it revolves the canopy of stars. The sun and the moon (which are relatively small) both follow a daily celestial circuit above the earth. The moon produces its own light. [It is difficult to find any statement in the Bible that might account for the phases of the moon.] The Word also tells us that man will never measure the foundations of the earth or the depths of space. This would strongly suggest that space travel is impossible.

It may help to list God's account of the universe, point by point, next to Satan's *Alternative Reality* – see table overleaf:

The great tragedy for Christianity is that many today who profess to believe God's Word have rejected most of the truths given in the lefthand column. Indeed, it is probably fair to say that less than one percent believe all of them.

Why should this be so? Again, we must take into account the Adversary's remarkable power to deceive. He knows he can save himself from the Lake of Fire only by securing absolute control over the minds and hearts of men. If he can do this he can get them to cooperate in repudiating at least one of God's prophetic promises. The more he can control the minds of men, the more he can express himself through them. As we advance rapidly into the End Time, he has succeeded in adding to his team a large number of highly influential and talented individuals who, in return for wealth and prestige, are prepared to do his bidding and propagate his lies.

Christians have forgotten this. They have forgotten that, until such time as Christ returns to earth, Satan is the god of this world. This means he can utilize its vast wealth to his own advantage and dispose of it according to his will. The super-wealthy dynastic bloodlines that control this world are actively helping him implement his plan and carry out his deception.

God's reality	Satan's 'alternative reality'
The earth is flat	The earth is a sphere
The sun follows a path above the earth	The earth orbits the sun
The earth is the center of the universe	The earth is at the edge of the universe
The earth is a special creation	The earth is a trivial speck
The earth was made for man	Man is a weird cosmic accident
The earth is completely stationary	The earth is moving in several directions
The laws of the universe were set by God	The laws of the universe are accidental
The stars rotate around the earth	The stars only appear to rotate around the earth
The sun is reasonably close to the earth	The sun is 93 million miles away
The stars are not 'light years' away	The stars are millions of light years away
The earth is only a few thousand years old	The universe is 14 billion years old
The stars are fixed	The stars are receding
There is no life on any planet or star	Life is certain to have 'evolved' elsewhere
The volume of space is fixed	The universe is continually expanding
The universe has been damaged by sin	There is no sin
God sustains the universe by His mercy	The universe has no need of God
Christ has redeemed the universe	The universe is evolving
Christ will come again and claim the earth	A perfectly evolved man will rule the earth

## The Heliocentric Deception

For Satan, the most important deceptions are those that undermine the faith that men place in the veracity of the Book of Genesis, notably the first eleven chapters, and the events outlined in the Book of Revelation. Using his servants in Rome in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and London in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, he has succeeded in devising an alternative reality that most of mankind believes to be true.

His first great breakthrough came when he got men to believe that the earth revolves around the sun. The 'opposition' that the Catholic Church expressed to this idea was nothing but a pretense, a deliberate act of slow capitulation. After all, the men who were advancing the heliocentric theory were themselves the agents of Rome. These included Nicolaus Copernicus, whose major treatise on heliocentricity – *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres* – was published in 1543, but which, incredibly, was not condemned by the Catholic Church for over sixty years!



This gave the idea plenty of time to gain unofficial acceptance in academic circles across Europe. No doubt many assumed that, if the extremist mentality that prevailed at the Council of Trent (1545-1563) had not condemned it, then it must have been admissable, at least unofficially.

It should be noted that Copernicus was a loyal Roman Catholic who was likely ordained to the priesthood later in life. As the *Catholic Encyclopedia* states: "There is no document to show that Copernicus ever received higher orders...[but]...the fact that in 1537 King Sigismund of Poland put his name on the list of four candidates for the vacant episcopal seat of Ermland, makes it probable that, at least in later life, he had entered the priesthood." Galileo also referred to "the priest Copernicus."

By the time Galileo began to lobby on behalf of the heliocentric theory, it was already well established in many universities. Papal opposition was only a shadow of the response that a heresy of this magnitude would normally have encountered. In short, Rome, and specifically the Jesuit Order – which was directing the entire affair – was deceitfully undermining Biblical truth while pretending to defend it. As might be expected, the only serious opposition came from Protestant theologians – who were more than familiar with the agenda that Rome was pursuing.

Johannes Kepler, another well-known champion of the heliocentric theory, was a professional astrologer who cast horoscopes for rich patrons. Though he professed to be a Lutheran, he rejected the Biblical account of the cosmos. He also appropriated by far the most valuable archive of astronomical observations in Europe when Tycho Brahe, the royal astronomer, died unexpectedly at age 55. Had he lived, Brahe had intended to publish a scientific thesis, using the same data, in support of an earth-centered (or geocentric) celestial system. This 'fortuitous' event, which may have involved foul play, enabled Kepler to extensively reinterpret the data in support of his heliocentric theory.

Satan had everything to gain by promoting the heliocentric system, and nothing to lose. Here is a list of just some of the benefits from his point of view:

1. The Bible is proven wrong in a matter of great importance. Men will therefore begin to doubt other Biblical truths.
2. Men will also begin to doubt their own senses. Instead they will accept the authority of science. If science says, 'this is how it is', then men will set aside their common sense and believe whatever the scientific authorities are telling them.
3. The rise of science will enable Satan to develop more lies – such as manmade global warming or space travel or evolution or the 'Big Bang' or 'millions of light years' or transhumanism. Indeed, the supposed existence of devices that can cause nuclear explosions may be one of Satan's many deceptions.

STANDARD FORM 1012-A Title 7, GAO Manual 1012-210		TRAVEL VOUCHER MEMORANDUM				
DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT <b>NASA - Manned Spacecraft Center</b>		VOUCHER NO. <b>014501</b>				
PAYEE'S NAME <b>Col. Edwin E. Aldrin 00018</b>		SCHEDULE NO.				
MAILING ADDRESS <b>PLEASE MAKE CHECK PAYABLE TO:</b> <b>Nasau Bay National Bank</b> <b>P.O. Box 58003</b> <b>Houston, Texas 77032</b> <b>Account #1-0348-9</b>		PAID BY				
OFFICIAL DUTY STATION <b>Houston, Texas</b>	RESIDENCE	CHECK NO.				
FOR TRAVEL AND OTHER EXPENSES FROM (DATE) <b>7-7-69</b> TO (DATE) <b>7-27-69</b>	TRAVEL ADVANCE Outstanding \$	CASH PAYMENT OF \$				
APPLICABLE TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION(S) NO. <b>X-22002</b> DATE <b>6/18/69</b>	Amount to be applied	RECEIVED (DATE)				
	Balance to remain outstanding \$					
TRANSPORTATION REQUESTS ISSUED						
TRANSPORTATION REQUEST NUMBER	AGENT'S VALUATION OF TICKET	INITIALS OF CARRIER ISSUING TICKET	MODE, CLASS OF SERVICE, AND ACCOM- MODATIONS *	DATE ISSUED	POINTS OF TRAVEL	
					FROM-	TO-
<b>Gov. Air</b>					<b>Houston, Texas</b>	<b>Cape Kennedy, Fla. Moon Pacific Ocean (USN Hornett) Hawaii and return to Houston, Texas</b>
<b>8-4-69</b>					AMOUNT CLAIMED	Dollars    Cts <b>23   31</b>
APPROVED (Supervisory and other approvals when required)				DIFFERENCES:		
NEXT PREVIOUS VOUCHER PAID UNDER SAME TRAVEL AUTHORITY VOUCHER NO.      D.O. SYMBOL      DATE (MONTH-YEAR)				Total verified correct for charge to appropriation(s) (initials) <b>23   31</b>		
				Applied to travel advance (appropriation symbol)		
<b>AUG 26 1969</b> <b>C. W. Bird</b> Authorized Certifying Officer				NET TO TRAVELER <b>23   31</b>		
ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION <b>039-00-00-00-CA-2031-CB11</b>						

\* Abbreviations for Pullman accommodations: MR, master room; DR, drawing room; CP, compartment; BR, bedroom; DSR, duplex single room; RM, roomette; DRM, duplex roomette; SOS, single occupancy section; LB, lower berth; UB, upper berth; LB-UB, lower and upper berth; S, seat.

On 30 July 2015, Buzz Aldrin, the NASA astronaut who allegedly walked on the moon with Neil Armstrong, released a copy of his 'Travel Voucher', a humorous claim for mileage expenses which he submitted to the NASA authorities after he 'returned' from the moon. Given that the number was purely random, it is notable that he chose '3331', an arrogant signal to fellow Freemasons.



4. Since most occult systems identify god with the sun, the heliocentric model gives pride of place to the 'great' solar deity, Satan himself.
5. The earth can be trivialized by relegating it to the very edge of the universe. It is not only 'the third rock from the sun', but a tiny, meaningless speck in the vast depths of space.
6. If the earth is a meaningless speck, then man himself cannot possibly be made in the image and likeness of God. Today he is depicted by science as a higher primate whose numbers must be drastically culled in order to 'save the planet'.
7. If the Bible is wrong, it can be portrayed as a manmade artefact. As such it is no different from the 'scriptures' of other religions. Anyone who insists otherwise can be accused of bigotry or provocation, and punished accordingly.

### **The Bible Warns about Sun Worship**

The Bible warns us of the extent to which Satan wants to be worshipped in the form of the sun. While many passages address this, perhaps the most graphic are found in chapter eight of Ezekiel. The prophet is taken by God from his base in Babylon and brought "in the visions of God" to the Temple at Jerusalem. True Christians need to fully understand what happened next since it reveals the deathly dark scheme that Satan is still operating today:

**[3] And he put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head; and the spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem, to the door of the inner gate that looketh toward the north; where was the seat of the image of jealousy, which provoketh to jealousy.**

[The image in question was a statue of Satan, or its equivalent. As the Wicked One states in Isaiah 14:13, "I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north".]

**[6] He said furthermore unto me, Son of man, seest thou what they do? even the great abominations that the house of Israel committeth here, that I should go far off from my sanctuary? but turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations.**

[The LORD says that this vile image provokes Him to jealousy (which is why it is called "the image of jealousy"). It is Satan's intention, by desecrating the Temple, to compel the LORD to remove His holy presence. (God did this shortly thereafter, but only because of man's persistent idolatry and iniquity, not because He was unable to defeat the Enemy. God could have instantly destroyed Satan at any time.)]

**[10] So I went in and saw; and behold every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, poured upon the wall round about.**

[The secret room inside the Temple, known only to the 'initiates' of the sun cult, was decorated with all kinds of pagan idols and forbidden animal imagery. Again, this is a deliberate provocation, a grossly offensive insult to the LORD God of Israel whose House it was.]

**[11] And there stood before them seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel, and in the midst of them stood Jaazaniah the son of Shaphan, with every man his censer in his hand; and a thick cloud of incense went up.**

[This is the next abomination or act of sacrilege. These men, the elders or leaders of Israel, were actually priestly initiates of a solar cult and secret worshippers of the sun god.]

**[13] He said also unto me, Turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations that they do.**

**[14] Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the LORD's house which was toward the north; and, behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz.**

**[15] Then said he unto me, Hast thou seen this, O son of man? turn thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations than these.**

[Thus far we have seen a series of abominations in the Temple of God, each worse than the one before it. These comprised (i) a statue of Satan, (ii) a secret room furnished with vile pagan idols, (iii) a gathering of seventy elders to worship Satan with incense, and (iv) a gathering of women at the very door of the Temple, weeping for Tammuz (a Babylonian term for Satan). They were mourning the death of Nimrod (Tammuz), who would be reborn as the son of Semiramis (also known as the goddess Isis or Astarte).]

**[16] And he brought me into the inner court of the LORD's house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the LORD, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the LORD, and their faces toward the east; and they worshipped the sun toward the east.**

[The LORD describes this scene as the most abominable of all – open sun worship.]

Satan strives to be like God. Since God never changes, but is the same yesterday, today, and forever, Satan wants to exhibit the same characteristic. However, as a created being, he is continually learning. To that extent he can't help changing. But he still wants to be worshipped today as he was in ancient times.

The "ancients of the house of Israel" – who exercised complete political control over Israel – were secret worshippers of Satan in the form of the sun. Similarly, the elite cabal of ancient families that control the world today are also secret worshippers of Helios-Apollo (Satan), the sun god. Like the ancients of Israel, they too want to build a permanent wall of separation between the LORD and mankind. They even pretend to worship the One True God.

Since these families are immensely wealthy, they are able to finance global deceptions of the most vile and despicable kind. Is this too much to believe? If you think so, then I would suggest you read chapter 8 of Ezekiel again and again. Let its awful message seep into your mind. Then follow this by reading Psalms 64 and 140, which describe the "wicked" in their true colors.

## **CONCLUSION**

### **The Great End Time Deception**

Is the NASA space program a deception? Yes. It is just like Hollywood or Disney or Dreamworks, a fantasy factory for the masses of mankind. They were conceived by Gnostics, built by Gnostics, and are run by Gnostics, all with the overriding purpose of convincing the world that Satan is the one true god. As such they are all part of the great End Time deception.

Christians need to reflect carefully on a foundational truth of Biblical theology, one that is often overlooked, even though it sheds considerable light on the questions we have been addressing – God made the earth for His Son:

**"For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him" (Colossians 1:16)**

Note those words, **"and for him."**

Look also at Psalm 2, which describes the worldwide revolt against the LORD God of Israel at the time of the Tribulation. I think all Christians, and especially pastors, need to memorize this Psalm since it speaks with sparkling clarity of the challenge that now faces each and every one of us:

### **Psalm 2**

- 1 Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?**
- 2 The kings of the earth set themselves,  
and the rulers take counsel together,  
against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying,**
- 3 Let us break their bands asunder,  
and cast away their cords from us.**
- 4 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh:  
the Lord shall have them in derision.**
- 5 Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath,  
and vex them in his sore displeasure.**
- 6 Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.**
- 7 I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me,  
Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.**
- 8 Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance,  
and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.**
- 9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron;  
thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.**
- 10 Be wise now therefore, O ye kings:  
be instructed, ye judges of the earth.**
- 11 Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling.**
- 12 Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way,  
when his wrath is kindled but a little.  
Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.**

This Psalm solemnly proclaims the sovereignty that Christ will exercise over the entire world! He will possess the "uttermost parts of the earth". Every heathen nation will be obliged to submit to his authority. All who oppose him will be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel.

### **What *kind* of Earth did God make for His Son?**

As the only Son of God, Christ Jesus will rule the entire earth, the same earth that God made for Adam.

If this is so, then we need to ask whether our heavenly Father would have made the earth no more than a little speck at the edge of the universe, knowing that His Son would one day rule over it? Would He have allowed the sun to dominate the universe, when His Word clearly places the earth at the center? Would He have created alien civilizations when His Word makes it perfectly plain that He did nothing of the sort? Would He have put the stars and galaxies so far away that we cannot even comprehend the distances involved?

Of course not!

Our heavenly Father made the truly wonderful earth described in the Book of Genesis for His Son. Adam was the initial beneficiary and sovereign, but he failed, as God knew he would. The last Adam – Christ Jesus of Nazareth – is now the sole legal owner and monarch-in-waiting of all creation.

The earth was made for (and by) Christ. In its original state, at the time of creation, it was a place of unsurpassed beauty. Even today, wracked by the damage that sin has inflicted, it is still remarkably beautiful. As a further gift to His Son, the Father will fully restore the earth to its original perfection at the end of the Millennium.

Satan hates our heavenly Father. He hates Christ Jesus, His Son. He hates the earth and everyone on it. And he will tell every lie he can think of – and murder as many people as he considers necessary – to reign here in the place of Christ. Some of his lies are outrageous, but in their fallen state, men and women everywhere are strongly disposed to believe them.

---

**Jeremy James**  
**Ireland**  
**August 18, 2015**

**For further information visit [www.zephaniah.eu](http://www.zephaniah.eu)**

**Copyright Jeremy James 2015**